U.S. Patent Appl. No. 10/711,386

Examiner: MAYLE, Edward J.

Response to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

Page 8 of 10

REMARKS

The application as filed included 40 claims. The Examiner required restriction to one of the following species:

- I. Figs. 1A, 1B, 1C and 5;
- II. Figs. 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B; and
- III. Fig. 4

Applicant confirms the election to prosecute species I, shown in Figs. 1A, 1B, 1C and 5. Claims 1, 4-17, 39 and 40 are readable on the elected species. Independent claims 1 and 8 are generic. Claims 2, 3 and 18-38 are withdrawn from consideration.

Upon election of species I, the Examiner further required restriction to one of the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1 and 4-17; and
- II. Claims 39-40.

Applicant confirms the election to prosecute the group I claims (1 and 4-17). Claims 39 and 40 are canceled without prejudice.

The Examiner indicated that dependent claims 4, 9-11 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. With regard to claims 4 and 9-11, the Examiner stated that "the prior art does not teach aircraft galley counters that are coupled to or extending in front of aircraft doorways." Applicant has introduced new claims 41 and 42 to recite this feature. Independent claim 41 is a combination of original claims 1 and 4, without the limitation regarding the depth of the aft area, which is not necessary for patentability. No new matter has been added.

U.S. Patent Appl. No. 10/711,386

Examiner: MAYLE, Edward J.

Response to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

Page 9 of 10

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the "galley storage unit" has a depth approximately equal to the depth of two or more galley carts, and the "main counter" is "coupled to and between a starboard wall and a port wall of the aircraft". Independent claim 8 recites similar features. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,055,317 to Greiss. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. Greiss does not disclose, teach or suggest a "galley storage unit" having the depth of two or more galley carts, or a counter "coupled to and between a starboard wall and a port wall of the aircraft" as recited in independent claims 1 and 8. Instead, Greiss discloses four separate storage areas 34, 36, 38 and 40, each proportioned deep enough to hold one storage unit 42. [Col. 4, lines 15-18; Fig. 4] The Examiner correctly points out that the storage area 40 has a countertop 56, but that countertop floats in the center of the aircraft. Greiss does not disclose, teach or suggest that the countertop 56 is coupled to the starboard and port walls of the aircraft or that it extends across the cabin crew area. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 8, and all claims depending thereon recite elements that are not disclosed in Greiss. This rejection must be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiss in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,491,979 to Kull. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is believed patentable over Greiss alone for the reasons set forth above. Kull does not overcome the deficiencies of Greiss. Indeed, the

¹ The "galley storage unit" recited in Applicant's claims refers, for example, to the galley storage units 50 in the storage structure 32 shown in FIG. 1A. See paragraph 30 of the specification.

U.S. Patent Appl. No. 10/711,386

Examiner: MAYLE, Edward J.

Response to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

Page 10 of 10

Examiner only cites Kull for disclosing a refrigeration unit for an aircraft. Kull does not

disclose, teach or suggest the features recited in independent claims 1 or 8, or any of the claims

depending thereon. Therefore, the combination of Greiss and Kull does not yield Applicant's

invention. Accordingly, this rejection must be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-17, 41 and 42 are in

condition for allowance. Since claims 1 and 8 are generic to the withdrawn claims, Applicant

submits that withdrawn claims 2, 3 and 18-38 are allowable. If any issues remain to be

resolved, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Attorneys for Applicant

<u>September 20, 2006</u>

Date

/joshua s. broitman/ Joshua S. Broitman

Registration No. 38,006

OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN, PC

250 Park Avenue, Suite 825 New York, NY 10177-0899

Phone: (212) 681-0600

Customer No. 64722